

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1467 OF 2025
IN
CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 2485 OF 2024**

Sachin Hindurao Waze ..Applicant
Versus
Union of India Through
the S.P, National Investigation Agency & Anr. ..Respondents

Mr. Rounak Naik, for the Applicant.
Mr. Sandesh Patil a/w. Chintan Shah for Respondent/NIA.
Mr. S. V. Gavand, APP for the State.
Mr. Akhilesh Singh, NIA, Mumbai, present.

**CORAM : SARANG V. KOTWAL &
S. M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 28 APRIL 2025

PC :

1. This is an interim application filed in the decided Criminal writ petition No.2485 of 2024. The said writ petition was decided by a speaking order dated 06.03.2025. We had given full opportunity to the learned counsel for the Applicant herein i.e. the original petitioner to put-forth his case and whatever was argued before us was considered by us in our order. We had specifically given sufficient opportunity. In fact, the matter was adjourned on

some occasions to enable the learned counsel to prepare and to make the submissions in all respect. In spite of that, the submissions were made only in respect of the arguments which are dealt with in the said order dated 06.03.2025. In spite of this position, the Applicant has very unfairly preferred this application mentioning that this Court had confined the scope of argument to the grounds considered in the final order. These averments in the application are absolutely incorrect. The matter was heard at length in open Court in presence of the learned counsel for both the parties.

2. Mr. Sandesh Patil, learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1-NIA strongly objects to even considering the present application. He submitted that the Applicant was given full opportunity to put-forth all his grounds, but the arguments were restricted only to the grounds which were dealt with by this Court in the order dated 06.03.2025. We have specifically mentioned so in paragraph-2 and 35 of the said order; which read thus:

“2. This is a writ petition praying for writ of *habeas corpus* alleging that the Petitioner’s detention is illegal. The Petitioner is seeking his release forthwith. Though, there are many grounds raised in the petition, learned counsel for the Petitioner restricted his arguments to the grounds which are

noted and considered in the following discussion.

35. Though, the petition runs into many pages and many grounds are taken, learned counsel for the petitioner specifically restricted his arguments only to the submissions which we have noted down in this order.”

We had taken care to specifically mention this fact because the learned counsel for the Petitioner had specifically restricted his arguments only to the grounds which we have dealt with in our order.

3. In this view of the matter, we are not inclined to entertain this application at all. However, in the interest of justice, it is clarified that the Applicant is at liberty to prefer bail application on the merits of the matter and in such case, the said bail application shall be decided on its own merits in accordance with law.

4. The Application is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(SARANG V. KOTWAL, J.)